What are the risks and effects of UVC sterilization, including the risk of endotoxins in consumer appliances?

UVC sterilization poses documented risks including cellular damage to skin and eyes from brief exposures, degradation of indoor air quality through increased particle and gas-phase concentrations, and variable device quality issues where some consumer products fail to emit germicidal wavelengths or lack adequate safety features; however, the specific question of endotoxin risks in consumer UVC appliances cannot be answered as none of the reviewed literature addressed this topic.

Abstract

This systematic review of ten sources identifies multiple documented risks associated with UVC sterilization devices. Laboratory studies demonstrate dose-dependent cellular damage including decreased viability, oxidative stress, and lipid peroxidation in skin cells , with exposure times as brief as 30-70 seconds causing significant biological effects including apoptosis and senescence . Eye tissues, particularly epithelial retinal cells, exhibit heightened sensitivity compared to skin cells . Consumer survey data found 30-46% of device owners reported side effects, though analysis revealed inconsistencies suggesting misattribution or psychosomatic responses rather than actual UV-C injury . Device effectiveness issues compound safety concerns: one commercial device claiming 253 nm UVC emission was found to primarily emit blue-violet light rather than germicidal wavelengths , while missing safety interlocks on some devices allow user exposure to radiation . High-intensity UVC devices also produce dramatic increases in airborne particle concentrations and gas-phase species that persist for 30-40 minutes post-operation , representing an underappreciated respiratory risk pathway.

Critically, none of the ten reviewed sources reported any findings related to endotoxin formation, release, or health effects from UVC sterilization . This represents a significant gap in the literature, as UVC treatment of bacterial contamination could theoretically release endotoxins from lysed gram-negative bacteria, but this potential risk remains entirely uncharacterized in consumer appliance contexts. The evidence supports wavelength-dependent risk stratification, with far-UVC (222 nm) considered safer for occupied spaces than standard 254 nm UVC , though safety depends critically on spectral purity and device design quality.

Paper search

We performed a semantic search using the query "What are the risks and effects of UVC sterilization, including the risk of endotoxins in consumer appliances?" across over 138 million academic papers from the Elicit search engine, which includes all of Semantic Scholar and OpenAlex.

We retrieved the 50 papers most relevant to the query.

Screening

We screened in sources based on their abstracts that met these criteria:

- **UVC Consumer Technology Focus**: Does this study examine UVC sterilization technology in consumer appliances (e.g., air purifiers, water sterilizers, surface disinfection devices, food sterilizers)?
- **Safety or Efficacy Outcomes**: Does this study report on safety risks, adverse effects, unintended consequences, endotoxin formation, sterilization efficacy, or antimicrobial effectiveness related to UVC sterilization?

- **Empirical Evidence Type**: Is this study an experimental study, observational study, case report, systematic review, or meta-analysis that contains original data or empirical findings (not just opinion pieces, editorials, or commentary without data)?
- **Appropriate Study Setting**: Was this study conducted in laboratory, controlled, or real-world consumer use settings (as opposed to purely theoretical or computational modeling)?
- **Consumer vs Industrial/Medical Systems**: Does this study focus on consumer appliances rather than exclusively on industrial-grade, medical-grade, or healthcare facility UVC systems?
- **UVC Radiation Specificity**: Does this study examine UVC radiation (not exclusively UV-A or UV-B radiation without any UVC component)?
- **Health/Safety Relevance**: Does this study address safety, biological outcomes, or health-related effects (not solely focusing on material durability or equipment performance without safety implications)?

We considered all screening questions together and made a holistic judgement about whether to screen in each paper.

Data extraction

We asked a large language model to extract each data column below from each paper. We gave the model the extraction instructions shown below for each column.

- **UVC Device Type**:

  Extract detailed information about the UVC device/application studied including:

- Device type (handheld wand, cabinet/chamber, room disinfection, etc.)
- Wavelength(s) used (e.g., 222 nm, 254 nm, broad spectrum)
- Power/intensity specifications
- Intended use (consumer appliance, professional, medical)
- Brand/model if specified
- Installation type (portable, fixed, integrated)

- **Exposure Conditions**:

  Extract details about how exposure to UVC occurred including:

- Duration of exposure (seconds, minutes, hours)
- Distance from source
- Direct vs indirect exposure
- Frequency of use
- Room size/ventilation if relevant
- Whether device was used as intended or misused
- Any protective measures used or recommended

- **Health Effects**:

  Extract all reported health effects and risks including:

- Skin effects (erythema, burns, DNA damage, etc.)
- Eye effects (photokeratitis, irritation, etc.)
- Respiratory effects
- Self-reported symptoms vs clinically confirmed effects
- Severity and duration of effects

- Time to onset
- Any long-term or chronic effects
- Psychological/psychosomatic effects if mentioned

- **Air Quality Effects**:

  Extract information about indoor air quality impacts including:

- Particle formation or concentration changes
- Gas/chemical species changes
- Ozone production
- Volatile organic compound formation
- Any measured concentrations or exposure levels
- Comparison to air quality standards
- Duration of air quality effects

- **Effectiveness Issues**:

  Extract information about disinfection performance problems including:

- Inadequate microbial inactivation
- Incomplete coverage or shadowing effects
- Device malfunction or design flaws
- Discrepancies between claimed and actual performance
- Spectral analysis showing incorrect wavelengths
- Any correlation between poor effectiveness and increased exposure risk

- **Endotoxin Findings**:

  Extract any specific mention of endotoxins including:

- Endotoxin formation or release from UVC treatment
- Endotoxin levels measured
- Health effects attributed to endotoxins
- Risk of endotoxin exposure in consumer devices
- If no endotoxin findings mentioned, note 'Not reported'

- **Risk Factors**:

  Extract factors that increase or modify UVC risks including:

- User demographics (age, skin type, health conditions)
- Improper use or lack of safety awareness
- Device design flaws or missing safety features
- Environmental factors (room size, ventilation)
- Cumulative exposure patterns
- Lack of warnings or instructions

- **Study Design**:

  Extract study methodology including:

- Study type (laboratory, clinical trial, observational, survey, case study)
- Sample size and population

- Measurement methods used
- Duration of follow-up
- Control conditions if any
- Quality of evidence (self-reported vs objective measures)

Characteristics of Included Studies

The reviewed literature encompasses a diverse range of study designs examining UVC sterilization risks, from laboratory investigations to large-scale consumer surveys. The studies address various UVC device types across consumer and professional applications.

Study	Full Text Retrieved?	Study Type	Device Type	Wavelength	Primary Focus
Z. Adams et al., 2022	Yes	Observational survey (N=26,864)	Portable devices (lamps, boxes, vacuum cleaners)	Not specified	Self-reported side effects
Eleni Kardamila et al., 2025	No	Laboratory (in vitro)	Handheld wand (LP-Hg and LED)	Not specified	Skin cell damage
N. Alessio et al., 2024	Yes	Laboratory (in vitro)	Portable lamps	278 nm	Apoptosis and senescence
J. Arines et al., 2020	Yes	Laboratory	Cabinet/chamber	Claimed 253 nm	Device performance analysis
Lisa M Li et al., 2016	No	Laboratory	Tabletop device	Not specified	Microbiologic effectiveness
I. Barnard et al., 2020	Yes	Simulation study	Handheld wand	222 nm	Skin safety of far-UVC
R. Voelker et al., 2021	No	Regulatory communication	Handheld wand	Not specified	FDA safety warning
Ana Rita Pereira et al., 2023	Yes	Review	Multiple (robots, cabinets, handheld)	222 nm, 254 nm	Public space disinfection
F. Graeffe et al., 2023	Yes	Laboratory	Room disinfection (fixed)	254 nm	Indoor air quality effects
Mitchell K Ng et al., 2025	Yes	Narrative review	Integrated HVAC systems	Not specified	UV-C as alternative to QACs

The studies represent a mix of primary laboratory research, survey-based investigations, computational simulations, and literature reviews. Six of ten studies had full texts available. Device wavelengths ranged from 222 nm (far-UVC) to 278 nm, with 254 nm being the most commonly studied standard UVC wavelength. Consumer-grade portable devices featured prominently, though professional medical-grade equipment was also examined.

Health Effects

Skin and Eye Effects

Effect Type	Findings	Onset Time	Study Type
Cellular viability decrease	Dose-dependent decrease in skin fibroblasts	Immediate evaluation	In vitro
Oxidative stress	Increased with exposure duration	Immediate	In vitro
Lipid peroxidation	Dominant photooxidation mechanism, even at sublethal radiant exposure	Immediate	In vitro
Apoptosis	Substantial in epithelial retinal cells; gradual increase in fibroblasts with dose	72 hours post-exposure	In vitro
Senescence	Keratinocytes prone to senescence even at elevated UV doses; fibroblasts showed gradual amplification	72 hours post-exposure	In vitro
DNA damage (CPD formation)	Direct CPD formation in supra-basal and basal skin layers	Not specified	Simulation
Erythema	Induced at lower radiant exposures than required for bacteriostatic effects	Not specified	Simulation/clinical
Photokeratitis	Potential injury from UV-C wands	After only a few seconds of exposure	Regulatory
Self-reported skin burns/redness	30%-46% of device owners reported side effects	Often lasting 3 days to 1 month	Survey
Self-reported eye pain	Commonly reported alongside skin effects	Variable	Survey

Laboratory studies demonstrate clear dose-response relationships for cellular damage. Exposure times as brief as 70 seconds for one lamp and 30 seconds for another were sufficient to cause significant biological effects . The LP-Hg wand appeared to induce more severe effects than LED devices at equivalent irradiance levels . Epithelial retinal cells exhibited heightened sensitivity compared to skin cells, marked by substantial apoptosis, while keratinocytes demonstrated relative resilience to apoptosis but remained prone to senescence .

The self-reported survey data presents an interpretive challenge. While 30% to 46% of UV-C device owners reported experiencing side effects , detailed analysis revealed inconsistencies between reported and plausible effects associated with actual UV-C exposure . Alternative explanations include the nocebo effect, where expectations of harm lead to actual symptoms, and misattribution of unrelated symptoms to UV-C exposure . The duration of reported effects (3 days to 1 month) was often longer than expected based on clinical studies of acute UV-C injury .

Wavelength-Specific Safety Considerations

Wavelength	Safety Profile	Regulatory Limits	Key Concerns
222 nm (far-UVC)	Considered non-harmful for occupied spaces	23 mJ/cm² per 8 hours	Ozone production from some sources
254 nm (standard UVC)	Potential carcinogenic effects; harmful to skin and eyes	6 mJ/cm² per 8 hours	Cannot be used safely in occupied spaces
278 nm	Irreversible damage demonstrated in cell studies	Not specified	Available in consumer devices without adequate warnings

Far-UVC (222 nm) is theoretically safer due to limited tissue penetration, though one simulation study found that longer wavelengths above 250 nm may contribute to observed erythema and CPD formation, suggesting that careful filtering of UVC emissions is necessary to prevent tissue inflammation and pre-mutagenic DNA lesions .

Air Quality Effects

Parameter	Observed Effect	Magnitude	Recovery Time
Particle number concentration	Dramatic increase	From <1000 cm^{-3} to 4.5×10^{4} to 1.6×10^{5} cm^{-3}	~30-40 minutes post-shutdown
Particle formation rate	Significant new particle formation	250 particles cm^{-3} s^{-1} for 2.5 nm particles	Variable
Gas phase species	Nearly all monitored species increased	~1000 species affected	Not specified
VOCs	Increased during irradiation	Not quantified	Not specified
Ozone	Generally low; decreased during UVC operation	Low concentrations	N/A

The laboratory study examining a high-intensity (2 kW) hospital-grade device found that UVC irradiation caused dramatic increases in particle number concentrations, with formation rates of 250 particles cm^{-3} s^{-1} for ultrafine particles . This contradicts the common assumption that UVC primarily degrades organic compounds. The increase in VOCs during UVC irradiation was attributed to enhanced evaporation from surfaces rather than photochemical formation .

High particle concentrations are associated with adverse respiratory health effects, creating a potential risk when entering rooms shortly after UVC disinfection . The particle concentrations took approximately 30-40 minutes to return to pre-UVGI levels after device shutdown , indicating that ventilation timing is critical for safe room re-entry.

Ozone production represents an additional concern for certain UVC sources. The EPA advises against using ozone-emitting UVC lamps in closed premises without adequate ventilation . This is particularly relevant for far-UVC (222 nm) sources, which may generate ozone with respiratory implications .

Device Effectiveness and Design Issues

Issue Type	Specific Problems	Study
Wavelength discrepancy	Device claimed 253 nm emission; only one LED emitted UVC while others emitted blue-violet light	J. Arines et al., 2020
Inadequate coverage	Shadowed areas not disinfected; uneven irradiance distribution	J. Arines et al., 2020
Missing safety features	No security interlock; device operable with cover open, exposing users to radiation	J. Arines et al., 2020
Microbial survival	Growth observed on stainless steel carriers at low inoculums post-treatment	Lisa M Li et al., 2016
Insufficient dose	Irradiance and dose inadequate for effective disinfection outside LED vicinity	J. Arines et al., 2020
Biofilm penetration	Presence of biofilms hinders effective disinfection	Ana Rita Pereira et al., 2023
Validation gaps	Lack of established protocols and guidelines for UVC device validation	Ana Rita Pereira et al., 2023

Spectral analysis of one commercially available cabinet-type device revealed significant discrepancies between marketing claims and actual performance . While the device claimed to emit UVC at 253 nm, most LEDs actually emitted in the blue-violet region rather than the germicidal UVC range . This device design was characterized as unsuitable for complete disinfection .

The absence of security interlocks on some consumer devices allows operation with protective covers open, potentially exposing users to harmful radiation . An FDA safety communication warned that one handheld UV-C wand emits unsafe radiation levels capable of injuring skin and eyes within seconds of exposure .

Endotoxin Findings

None of the ten reviewed sources reported findings related to endotoxin formation, release, or health effects associated with UVC sterilization . This represents a significant gap in the literature, as UVC treatment of bacterial contamination could theoretically release endotoxins from lysed gram-negative bacteria. The absence of research on this topic means that endotoxin-related risks in consumer UVC appliances remain uncharacterized.

Risk Factors and Safety Considerations

Risk Factor Category	Specific Concerns
User awareness	Inadequate information accompanying devices for safe utilization ; untrained and uninformed users
Device design	Missing safety interlocks ; absence of shielding ; insufficient dosimetry systems
Environmental factors	Poor ventilation affecting air quality recovery ; low air exchange rates in household settings
Exposure patterns	Brief exposures (seconds to minutes) sufficient to cause irreversible cellular changes ; cumulative exposure limits exist for different wavelengths
Regulatory gaps	Lack of established protocols limiting safe use in human presence ; devices available online without proper guidance

The risk profile differs substantially between professional-grade equipment with integrated safety features (automated dose control, proximity sensors, AI-based safety algorithms) and consumer devices that may lack basic protective mechanisms. Professional devices like UVCeed incorporate cameras and proximity sensors to prevent exposure to humans or pets , while many consumer devices provide insufficient protection against accidental exposure.

Synthesis

The evidence reveals a complex risk-benefit landscape for UVC sterilization that varies systematically by device category, wavelength, and use context.

Reconciling Cellular Damage Evidence with Self-Report Data : The apparent contradiction between robust laboratory evidence of cellular damage at brief exposures and the high rate of potentially misattributed self-reported symptoms can be explained by exposure circumstances. Laboratory studies used controlled direct exposure to characterized radiation sources, while consumer survey respondents used heterogeneous devices—some of which may not emit UVC as claimed —under uncontrolled conditions. The finding that some devices emit primarily blue-violet light rather than germicidal UVC suggests that many consumer reports may involve devices incapable of causing the reported effects, supporting the misattribution hypothesis.

Wavelength-Dependent Risk Stratification : The evidence supports different safety profiles for far-UVC (222 nm) versus standard UVC (254 nm). Standard UVC poses documented risks to skin and eyes at the exposure limits necessary for effective disinfection , making it unsuitable for occupied spaces. Far-UVC is theoretically safer due to limited tissue penetration , though the simulation evidence suggesting that contaminating longer wavelengths may contribute to observed biological effects indicates that safety depends critically on spectral purity.

Air Quality as an Underappreciated Risk Domain : The dramatic increases in particle and gas-phase concentrations documented during high-intensity UVC operation represent a risk category distinct from direct radiation exposure. This effect scales with device intensity and duration , with recovery times of 30-40 minutes under typical ventilation conditions . For consumer devices in household settings with low air exchange rates , these air quality effects may persist longer, though lower-intensity consumer devices have not been systematically studied for air quality impacts.

Device-Specific Risk Assessment : The evidence supports categorizing devices into distinct risk tiers:

- Professional devices with integrated safety systems present the lowest user risk profile when operated according to protocols
- Consumer wands and portable devices present variable risks depending on emission characteristics, safety features, and user training
- Cabinet-type devices present effectiveness concerns and potential exposure risks if operated without safety interlocks

The absence of endotoxin research across all reviewed sources represents a systematic blind spot in the literature that cannot be addressed through synthesis of existing evidence.

References

Ana Rita Pereira, D. F. Braga, Mariana Vassal, I. Gomes, and M. Simões. "Ultraviolet C Irradiation: A Promising Approach for the Disinfection of Public Spaces?" *Science of the Total Environment*, 2023.

Eleni Kardamila, Chara Almpani, Andreas Vitsos, Dimitra Ieronymaki, Aspasia Petri, and Michail Rallis. "In Vitro Assessment of Portable, Domestic UV-C Disinfection Devices' Effects on Skin Fibroblasts." *Cutaneous and Ocular Toxicology*, 2025.

F. Graeffe, Yuan-Lai Luo, Yishuo Guo, and M. Ehn. "Unwanted Indoor Air Quality Effects from Using Ultraviolet C Lamps for Disinfection." *Environmental Science &Amp; Technology Letters*, 2023.

I. Barnard, E. Eadie, and K. Wood. "Further Evidence That Far-UVC for Disinfection Is Unlikely to Cause Erythema or Pre-mutagenic DNA Lesions in Skin." *Photodermatology, Photoimmunology & Photomedicine*, 2020.

J. Arines, and C. Bao-Varela. "Beware of UVC Sanitizer." *medRxiv*, 2020.

Lisa M Li, T. Wong, E. Rose, Graham Wickham, and E. Bryce. "Evaluation of an Ultraviolet C Light-Emitting Device for Disinfection of Electronic Devices." *American Journal of Infection Control*, 2016.

Mitchell K Ng, Michael A. Mont, and P. Bonutti. "Clinical and Environmental Harms of Quaternary Ammonium Disinfectants and the Promise of Ultraviolet-C (UV-C) Alternatives: A Narrative Review." *Cureus*, 2025.

N. Alessio, Alessia Ambrosino, Andrea Boggi, Domenico Aprile, Iole Pinto, G. Galano, U. Galderisi, and G. Di Bernardo. "Germicidal Lamps Using UV-C Radiation May Pose Health Safety Issues: A Biomolecular Analysis of Their Effects on Apoptosis and Senescence." *Aging*, 2024.

R. Voelker. "UV-C Disinfecting Device Poses Radiation Risk." *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)*, 2021.

Z. Adams, C. Bechlivanidis, Magda Osman, J. O'Hagan, and D. Naldzhiev. "Self-reported Side-effects of Ultraviolet-C Disinfection Devices." *Photochemistry and Photobiology*, 2022.